



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,840	11/06/2000	John A. Drewe	1735.0410002/RWE/BEC	8076

7590 01/28/2002
Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox PLLC
Attorneys at Law
Suite 600
1100 New York Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20005-3934

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1625

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,840

Applicant(s)

DREWE ET AL.

Examiner

Binta M. Robinson

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period of Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 21, 25, 46, 47, 50-54, 59 and 60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 41, 42, 44, 45, 63-72, 78 and 80 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 26, 28, 75, 79 and 81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1,5-7,9,13,14,16,18,21,25-28,30,32-42,44-47,50-54,57,59,60,63-72 and 75-81.

Art Unit: 1625

D tailed Action

The 112, first paragraph rejections of claims 1-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 25-28, 30, 32-47, 49-51, 53-54, 57-58, 60, 63-72, 75-78 and the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claim 1 at paper no. 7 are rendered moot in light of applicant's amendment at paper no. 10/B.

The restriction requirement at paper no. 7 is revised to restrict out claims 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 21, 25 and 46-47, 50, 51, 52-54, 57, and 59-60 and include them in group II since they concern compounds of formula II.

(old rejection)

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for reasons of record at paper no. 610/B because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the method of treating all of the various cancers. No drug can treat all of these cancers. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement.

The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in Ex parte foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In terms of the first Wands factor of breadth, the treatment of a wide range of cancers with a compound of claim 1 is being claimed. In terms of the nature of the invention which is the second Wands factor, these compounds are useful in the treatment of various cancers. In terms of the fifth Wands factor, the caspase potency ranges from 7 which is poor to 364 which are great. There are massive differences in caspase potency

for small changes in structure. For example, compound 97 has a 3 bromo instead of a 2 bromo and a methyl on the 4H-indolo ring. However, the caspase potency compound 7 whereas it is 364 for compound 95. The level of predictability regarding caspase potency is low. In terms of the sixth Wands factor, the amount of direction provided by the inventor is poor, because the applicant does not test compounds for their affects on

the specific diseases claimed. The applicant must show tests results for the cancers claimed involving specific cell lines. In terms of the 8th Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

(new objections and rejections)

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 5, 26, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the method of treating all diseases related to a disorder responsive to the induction of apoptosis in an animal suffering therefrom. The induction of apoptosis in a mammal is a mechanism not a disease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement.

keep

The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in Ex parte foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In terms of the first Wands factor of breadth, the treatment of all diseases responsive to the induction of apoptosis in an animal with a compound of formula I are being claimed.

In terms of the nature of the invention which is the second

Wands factor, these compounds are useful as activators of caspases and inducers of apoptosis. In terms of the sixth Wands factor, the amount of direction provided by the inventor is poor, because the applicant does not test compounds for their affects on the specific diseases claimed. In terms of the 8th Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into

Art Unit: 1625

consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 75 and 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. In claims 75 and 81, the term "indolopyran" is indefinite because it is not a statutory class of invention. The "compound" is suggested.

Claims 27, 30, 32-35, 36-40, 76, 77, are objected to because they are based on a rejected claim.

Claims 41, 42, 44, 45, 63-72, 78, 80 appear to be allowable.

The IDS filed 11/17/01 has been considered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0193.

Binta Robinson

January 25, 2002

Alan L Rotman

ALAN L. ROTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
SPE. A.U. 1625